

REMARKS

The specification is amended in response to the Examiner's objection. Claim 1 is cancelled without prejudice, and Claim 2 is amended to incorporate the substance of its former parent claim. Claim 15 is amended to overcome the Examiner's objection, and Claim 17 is amended in response to the rejection of that claim as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 2-20 remain, with no claim previously allowed.

The Specification

Turning first to the specification, pages 19 and 20 are revised to identify the format button 1208 and the replace all button 1204. These revisions are made to correct the Examiner's objections in paragraph 3 of the last Office Action.

The Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's remarks concerning use of "Bernoulli". That word appears in the expression "Bernoulli cartridges" on page 7, line 10 of the specification. The Applicants respectfully submit that "cartridges" is appropriate generic terminology when used with "Bernoulli". In support, the Applicants submit a page printed from the Website www.xdr2.com and mentioning several kinds of cartridges, including the Bernoulli cartridge. Accordingly, the appearance of "Bernoulli" on page 7, line 10 is accompanied by appropriate generic terminology and requires no correction.

The Claims

Claim 15 is objected to as an improper multiple-dependent claim. The Applicants have amended that claim by replacing the reference to "claim 8" with the substance of that claim. As amended, Claim 8 is examinable on the merits.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response thereto, the Applicants are amending Claim 17 to recite a computer-implemented method for performing a find and replace dialog. The dialog performed by that method comprises a Find What field operative to select a text string to search for, a format button selectively operative to enable a format drop down button that displays a number of formatting attributes for selection by the user, and a find all button. The Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 17, as amended, is directed to statutory subject matter.

Turning to art-related rejections, Claims 1-4, 8, and 14-16 stand rejected as unpatentable over *Underdahl* in view of *WordPerfect V6.1*, both references as defined in paragraph 11 of the Office Action. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as applied to Claims 2 *et seq.*

Regarding Claim 2, the rejection asserts that the claim is "directed towards selecting a cell" and that *Underdahl* recites "Highlight the area you want to search". However, that assertion mischaracterizes the respective step and the overall method defined by Claim 2 and thus misapplies *Underdahl* to that claim.

In Claim 2, the step of determining the plurality of formatting characteristics of a cell in this spreadsheets is performed in response to selecting the cell containing the formatting characteristics. This step is discussed, with respect to the disclosed

embodiment of the present invention, in the specification commencing on line 8 of page 13. According to that disclosed embodiment, selecting the "Choose Format From Cell" button 420 produces a special-shaped cursor, which the user may then move to select one or more cells. The attributes of those selected cell(s) are determined and applied to all tabs of the format cells dialog.

Underdahl does not disclose or teach the aforementioned step of determining the plurality of formatting characteristics in response to selection of the cell. In that reference, the last paragraph on page 174 (Finding and Replacing Data) merely instructs the user to highlight a spreadsheet area the user wants to search, such as a database block as illustrated on that page. The user next must choose Edit, Find and Replace (*Underdahl* page 175), enter a search string into the Find text box, enter a Replacement string in the Replace text box, and then choose the type of search in the Look In field. Those steps in *Underdahl's* find-and-replace dialog fail to define the step of determining formatting characteristics of a cell in response to selecting the cell containing those formatting characteristics. Moreover, the cited passage in *Underdahl* is not even relevant to any particular step for determining a plurality of cell formatting characteristics. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have found from *Underdahl*, with or without the secondary reference *WordPerfect V6.1*, the teachings necessary to provide the method for populating a plurality of fields in a find dialog, comprising the particular step discussed above and the overall combination of steps recited in Claim 2. For that reason, Claim 2 is patentable over the applied art.

Claims 3-7 depend, directly or indirectly, from Claim 2 and thus are deemed patentable over the applied art for the reasons discussed above. Furthermore, Claim 3

calls for the selection of the cell (containing the determined formatting characteristics) to comprise receiving an indication of a selection made by a user. Claim 4 defines that indication as made when the user moves a cursor over the first cell and clicks a mouse button. Dependent Claim 5 recites that the cursor is shaped like an eyedropper. Dependent Claim 6 defines the plurality of fields in the find dialog to comprise certain specified fields, and Claim 7 recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in Claim 6. Each of those dependent claims recites an overall combination of elements that would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in view of *Underdahl* and *WordPerfect V6.1*, and so those claims are patentable over the applied art.

Independent Claim 8 defines a computer-implemented method for performing a find operation on a spreadsheet file. That method comprises the steps of determining if the text is entered in a find field of a find dialog, performing certain steps if text *is not* entered in the find field, and performing certain other steps if text *is* entered in the find field. Those other steps include determining whether formatting attributes are entered for the find operation; if so, then finding any cells in this spreadsheet with formatting attributes matching the entered formatting attributes and text matching the entered text; and, if no formatting attributes are entered for the find operation, then finding any cells in the spreadsheet with text matching the entered text.

This method is discussed, with respect to a disclosed embodiment of the present invention, commencing at the top of page 24 with reference to Fig. 14.

The rejection of Claim 8 asserts only that *Underdahl* "finds or replaces characters in a block of labels or formulas much like the search-and-replace feature in most word

processors". However, that rejection fails to address the particular steps comprising the method of Claim 8, most likely for the reason that *Underdahl* fails to disclose those computer-implemented steps. Thus, *Underdahl* fails to teach a computer-implemented method including the step of determining if text is entered in a find field and, accordingly, fails to disclose the logical steps following the determination that text is not /is entered in the find field. These logical sequences of steps comprising the computer-implemented method of Claim 8 come only from the Applicants' own invention, not from the art applied to that claim. Accordingly, Claim 8 and dependent Claims 9-13 (the last of which defines a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps of Claim 12) are patentable over that art.

Independent Claim 14 defines a computer-implemented method for performing a replace operation on a file of a spreadsheet program. That method is discussed, with respect to the disclosed embodiment of the invention, commencing at line 8 of page 25 and with reference to Fig. 15.

Claim 14 is rejected with the same rationale applied to Claim 8. Likewise, the foregoing reasons why *Underdahl* fails to disclose or suggest a computer-implemented method including the specific steps, and the logical interrelation of steps recited in that claim, apply as well to the patentability of Claim 4 over the applied art. Claim 14, and dependent Claims 15 and 16, define a computer-implemented method that was not taught to one of ordinary skill from the applied art. Nothing in that art directs one of ordinary skill to a computer-implemented method comprising the specific steps recited in Claim 14, or a computer-readable medium having those steps *per* Claim 16. Accordingly, those claims are patentable over the applied art.

Claims 5-7 are rejected as unpatentable over *Underdahl* in view of *WordPerfect V6.1*, and in further view of *Corel* (identified in paragraph 19 of the Office Action). *Corel* is added for teaching the shape of the cursor as an eyedropper. However, Claims 5-7 are patentable over the applied art for the reasons discussed above with respect to parent claim 2, and *Corel* does not supply (and was not cited for that purpose) the parent-claim element missing from the primary reference.

Claims 9-13 and 17-20 are rejected as unpatentable over *Underdahl* in view of *WordPerfect V6.1*, and further in view of *Bowman* (U.S. 6,000,225). *Bowman* is cited as disclosing a search operation of electronic documents with a results list. With respect to dependent Claims 9-13, however, the combination of references applied to those claims fails to overcome the above-discussed deficiencies with respect to the elements making up the steps of the parent claims. Accordingly, Claims 9-13 are patentable over *Underdahl* in view of *WordPerfect V6.1* and *Bowman*.

Regarding independent Claim 17, the rejection asserts that *Underdahl* and *WordPerfect V6.1* disclose formatting tools as described in the rejection of Claim 1. However, neither reference discloses the recited format button, alone or "selectively operative to enable a format drop down button..." as required by Claim 17. *Bowman's* "Search Now" button is argued as teaching the use of a button to launch a find all search, but that alleged teaching fails to supply to aforementioned elements of Claim 17 not found in *Underdahl* or *WordPerfect V6.1*. Accordingly, a method as defined in Claims 17-20 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill from the applied art.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. The Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and solicit a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD



Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Date: July 21, 2004

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100



**XDR2.com Index****Products we Sell**

Cables
 80 Min CDR Media
 Mini (185mb) CD-R
 Business Card CD/Rs
 CD/R Labels
 CD Stomper Supplies
 CD Sleeves/Envelopes
 CD Jewel Cases
 DVD Boxes / Cases
 DVD-R, RW & RAM
 Compact Flash Cards
 3½", 5¼" & 8" Disks
 Zip & Jaz Diskettes
 Data Cartridges
 8mm Tapes
 DDS (DAT) Tapes
 DLT Tapes
 Imaging Products
 Info Index
 Monthly Specials

[Send us an E-mail](#)[OLD Order Form](#)

© 2004 XDR2.COM CORP.

IOMega ZIP Disks, Jaz

& Bernoulli Cartridges

Zip	Jaz	Bernoulli	SyQuest
Select from IO Mega Products listed below?			
<u>ZIP Diskettes</u>	For both MAC & PC formats, in both 100MB & 250MB sizes.		
<u>JAZ Cartridge</u>	For both MAC & PC formats, in both 1GB & 2GB sizes.		
<u>Bernoulli Cartridge</u>	Bernoulli Cartridge *** DISCONTINUED ***		
<u>SyQuest Cartridges</u>	SyQuest Cartridges *** DISCONTINUED ***		

RECEIVED

JUL 27 2004

Technology Center 2100

[Home](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [View Cart / Check-Out](#) | [UPS Costs](#) | [Tracking](#) | [Search](#) | [Warehouse](#) | [Shows](#) | [Bookmark Us](#)

THU JUN 24 08:17:27 CDT 2004

UPDATED: 1/3/2004 10:12:24 PM UTC